



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE TEACHING OF HISTORY IN THE SOUTH.<sup>1</sup>

### A REPORT.

At a conference of the teachers of history from the South who were in attendance upon the meetings of the American Historical Association in Washington in December, 1901, the undersigned were appointed a committee to investigate and gather statistical and other data concerning the work done in history in the schools and colleges of the South. Gratefully recognizing the prompt and hearty co-operation of the teachers of history in this region, and acknowledging the valuable assistance and suggestions received from them and from others, the committee begs herewith to make report to all who are interested.

By the careful inspection of the official catalogues and announcements of a large number of institutions the committee was able to gather a considerable amount of valuable statistical material. An effort was made, and with very general success, to submit the information thus gained, together with certain general questions, to the professors of history in the respective institutions for their verification, correction, and comment. The study of this documentary material, and correspondence with the several institutions, together with the personal knowledge of the members of the committee concerning the conditions in various sections, have been the important factors in shaping the report.

Upward of sixty institutions have been embraced in the investigation. But measured by the standard of the requirements for admission, they are far from being all of the same grade. Indeed, students who may be admitted to some of the colleges in the list as regular freshmen would still need one, two, and even three more years of preparatory school work before they would be able to pass the regular examinations for entrance into some of the other colleges in the list. Yet they all rank as colleges in local popular estimation, and it seemed wise to include them in this review of southern conditions.

#### I. REQUIREMENTS IN HISTORY FOR ADMISSION.

It is convenient to begin the report with a discussion of the requirements for admission. Nearly every college nominally requires United

<sup>1</sup> Read by Professor F. W. Moore, of Vanderbilt University, at the annual meeting of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Southern States, the University of Mississippi, November, 1902.

States history; and many require ancient, or general, or English in addition. There is, perhaps, a tendency to group associated fields together, as English and American, Greek and Roman, ancient or mediæval and modern, and concentrate the preparatory study in one or two of several optional fields.

But the exhibit of requirements in history for admission looks better than it really is. The requirements are no greater for colleges with high requirements in other subjects than for those with low requirements; and for both the quality of the work accepted in history is very inferior. Some of it is nothing more nor less than that which is done in the grammar grades, and required for admission into a standard high school.

In the public schools, both the grammar and especially the high-school grades, history is accorded very little attention. It suffers in competition with other subjects from lack of appreciation and sheer neglect. Though the proprietor-principals of the very numerous private training schools, as a class, give to history a more prominent place in the curriculum, their facilities for teaching it are inadequate. Their institutions are unendowed. Two-thirds of them charge a very small tuition fee, not exceeding five dollars per month. Thus the total income is small, and so also is the teaching force, which under such conditions has to be regulated by the income and not by the pedagogical needs of the school. As a result each teacher has to instruct classes in quite a variety of subjects. It is well understood that Greek and Latin and mathematics cannot be taught even tolerably except by men who have had thorough and extended training in them. It is very wrongly supposed that history can be taught sufficiently well without such preparation. So principals go inconsiderately on to secure proper teachers for the first subjects named, and in so doing soon reach the financial limit to the size of the teaching corps; whereupon history and the other subjects have to be distributed out in the least unreasonable way possible under the circumstances. Moreover, the time of the pupil is overcrowded, as the work of the training school is now arranged, and subjects with higher and more exacting standards, and more difficult to pursue, naturally draw his attention from history.

The lack of uniformity in the secondary schools even of the same state must be mentioned as an influence deleterious to good work in history, as it is in the other subjects. Also the woeful lack of city and town and school libraries which, did they exist and were they used,

would greatly stimulate an interest in history through reading. If a reading public is to be developed in the South in the place of a talking public, not only must good and interesting histories and biographies be made accessible, but the book-reading habit must be cultivated in the youth. As things are now, the boy has against him not only habit, climate, example, and the influences of an agricultural life, but the serious lack of library facilities.

Thus students come to college poorly prepared in history. But the college professor of history, though he may have an assistant, can rarely give his undivided attention to even so comprehensive a subject. Consequently the amount and character of historical training which a student can possibly get is in few cases enough to qualify him properly to teach the subject. Yet upon him or upon others still less prepared falls the task of teaching it in the training school; and so the vicious circle is complete.

Some signs of improvement are noted in the reports from Georgia and Louisiana, and especially from Missouri, where the influence of the State University has already been felt. The schools which are approved by it and whose pupils are admitted without examinations are required to give two, and are encouraged to offer four, good courses in history, and must possess a reference library and historical maps. "The first two years' work must be devoted to general history. The third and fourth years may be given to English and American history, but these subjects will not be accepted unless preceded by the two years in general history. The schools are strongly urged to have the course in American history preceded by a course in English history." Though such a course is rare indeed in southern secondary schools, it has vindicated itself in practice elsewhere as both feasible and desirable; and it may well be made the goal of southern achievement in this matter, however thorough-going and extensive the adjustments necessary to make a curriculum in which it shall be a properly proportioned part.

## II. NUMBER OF INSTRUCTORS AND COURSES.

There is not an institution of the sixty-six under consideration that does not give some instruction in history; and only twelve that offer less than six hours, or the equivalent of two three-hour courses per year. On the other hand, only sixteen institutions offer as much as twelve hours per week, required and elective, graduate and undergraduate, altogether.

In sixty-six institutions 125 persons are teaching an aggregate of more than 658 hours per week throughout the year. This is an average of a little more than five hours per week per instructor. Or better, assuming that a fair amount of work for a college professor is twelve hours of recitations per week and that where there are two teachers the second is generally an assistant pursuing graduate work and teaching three to six hours per week, we shall find by inspection of the catalogues few instances where the teachers of history are wholly occupied in teaching that subject alone. In fact, they are expected to teach economics and a great variety of other subjects, and to bear a part of the burden of administration. With few exceptions the professors of history complain that the other demands upon their time are so great that they can but inadequately fulfil the obligations which they feel toward their chosen subject.

In 41 per cent. of the institutions under consideration there is still a traditional combination of history with philosophy; or a purely factitious and merely convenient combination of history with Greek or Latin, French or English, chemistry or mathematics; or, indeed, history may be parceled out among several professors of other subjects. But the situation is changing for the better. The increase of professorships in history, or history and economics (or political science, or sociology), is noticeable, especially in the state institutions, and in those under control of the board of education of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

More typical, therefore, both in respect of numbers and of tendency, are the cases where one professor, or one professor and an assistant, give all their time to the allied fields of history and economics. In a few institutions, notably the State Universities of Texas and Missouri and Johns Hopkins University, there is a corps of professors teaching history and political science exclusively.

### III. QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION.

The test of quality, though more delicate and difficult to apply justly, is even more important. There is unquestionably a very considerable degree of inequality in the character of instruction, and some of the causes for it are quite evident.

In the first place, the students are deficient in the character and amount of their preparatory training. In scarcely ten institutions out of the sixty odd included in the table are the requirements for admission equal to the requirements for graduation from a standard twelve-grade

public-school system; and in nearly half they are more than one year, and even two or three years, short of this amount. Necessarily such students are deficient in general preparation, untrained in mind, and immature in years. More frequently than not, the history which they have had has been learned by methods that must be unlearned. The most that can be attempted and the best that can be hoped under such circumstances, in history or in any other subject of the curriculum, is really high-school-work. If it is well done, it is honorable to the teacher and profitable to the student. The incidence of the implied criticism, really a serious one, involving questions of educational policy, will be upon those who are satisfied to call this college work, and are not zealous in trying to raise its plane.

In the second place, it is apparent, upon careful and thorough consideration, that some who are teaching history in colleges have had no adequate preparation by special training for their positions. No doubt they themselves fully recognize it and regret it as much as anyone else. Such fitness as they have for the places they fill must be ascribed to long familiarity with the periods they teach and general pedagogical skill and experience. But pedagogical skill is not enough. If historical scholarship without even an average endowment of the genius for teaching would be wholly bad in a professor of history, the presence of the second quality and the absence of the first would be simply absurd.

The justification most frequently urged in defense of the policy that continues to make such poor provision for the teaching of history is the limited income of the institution. But this is a reason more plausible than sound. It depreciates history in comparison with other subjects, and ranks it among the impedimenta first to be thrown overboard under stress of weather. It has not been sufficient to prevent ambitious and progressive institutions or those which, like the Methodist colleges, have felt some outside pressure, from modernizing their methods in some degree, however limited their resources or however great the effort necessary to increase them. On the other hand, what shall be said of the educational ideals of an institution which calls itself a college, and yet so disparages history that it believes it can afford to have in its faculty a man to teach that subject who has not specially trained himself in it? Whatever the conditions, north or south, in the past, the value of history is now rapidly gaining recognition along with the other social sciences. History has a very vital relation to human life. It is the only subject which deals with all the

activities of man. If it is a good thing to have in a college faculty a man to instruct the students in the language of the Romans, and others to teach the languages of the Greeks and the French and the Germans and the English, how many men ought to be employed to teach the political, religious, industrial, artistic, and social development of these same peoples? Surely, if it takes five trained men to teach satisfactorily the language and literature of the five great historic peoples of the world, it will be at best a rather hard task for even a man of special training to teach all those phases of the lives of these same peoples which are not included in their language and literature, and yet are full of interest and instruction for us.

In addition to the inadequate provision for instruction in history, and the immaturity of the students, there is a third influence affecting the quality of the work which calls for enumeration in this connection. It is the limited time allotted to the study of the subject, which is complicated by the effort to cover a great deal of ground in the time allowed. It will be convenient, however, to incorporate the discussion of this point under the next heading.

#### IV. THE PEDAGOGICAL PURPOSE OF HISTORICAL INSTRUCTION.

The aims that a professor of history pursues with his college classes can be fairly summarized in a progressive series under four or five heads. He may aim to impart general information concerning the history of the human race. Its progress in civilization, especially the social, religious, and political phases of its development, is the theme. It is common practice to follow the stream of civilization from the eastern nations as a source down through Greece and Rome and mediæval Europe to modern times. The aim is accomplished by giving the student familiarity with the facts presented in a manual of general history. Another purpose will be to instruct the students in the principles and institutions of our own state and national governments. Courses in civics, courses on the national constitution specifically, or more general courses in constitutional history, furnish the medium for the accomplishment of this end. Thirdly, the effort may be to instruct them in the principles of historical interpretation. To this end a critical study must be made of one or more standard histories of a selected period, with a view to testing the author's judgments and verifying his identifications of related causes and effects. A fourth purpose may be to illustrate the principles of historical investigation. This is done by familiarizing the student with the sources by frequent

use of the commoner and more accessible ones. The fifth object may perhaps be described as a practical application of the preceding. The attempt is made to acquaint the student with the principles of historical generalization by requiring him under suitable guidance to conduct an original investigation of some historical problem.

These various aims are by no means mutually exclusive, though they are progressive. The committee would not presume to present them as a profound or complete analysis of the pedagogical purposes of historical instruction. But it is believed that they are fair inferences from the many hints and clues which are contained in the official college announcements, and reports disclosing the various aims and purposes of the different courses which are offered. In general, the more meager the course as a whole—*i. e.*, where the time allotted is brief and the subject is subordinated to other subjects—the more the first aim will predominate over any other by the offer of a course or even a series of short courses in general history with such text-books as the interesting manuals of Professor Myers. These books, entertaining as the students find them to be, are necessarily cursory; and where the course is so limited or planned that such books make the best text, it is quite plain that the professor has not the time nor has the student the data necessary to get that comprehension of great historical movements that young men of college age ought to be mature enough to acquire and ought to be getting. Upward of sixty courses in an aggregate of 325 may be not unfairly enumerated in this class.

Where the time at the disposal of the professor is a little larger, there is often an apparent striving, and in some cases a very pretentious effort, to cover the whole course of civilization from Mesopotamia to America with a text-book for each nation or epoch, instead of one general history for all.

Next in order, where the work is but meager, will appear the patriotic and sentimental utilitarianism of an added course in American civics or politics. There are perhaps twenty such courses. Taking the case where one course of sixty-nine or possibly eighty lessons is all that can be given to American history, and readily conceding the correctness of the professor's judgment that a course in Fiske's *Civics*, or Wilson's *State*, with Johnston's *Politics*, is the one out of which he can get the best results, considering his limitations, yet can we admit that his limitations is the only test which may fairly be applied to the case? As a course in American history for college men it must be counted meager.



In the stronger institutions, however, and to some extent in the smaller ones, there is a positive and well-advanced movement away from this which might be called the traditional grouping of courses, and a tendency to take special periods, however disconnected the consecutive courses may in consequence seem to be. In such cases the consideration which chiefly determines the epoch for study is the number and importance of the political and social institutions to be found in it. As between two such epochs there is even a tendency to take the one on which the newest and best helps are to be had.

The use of the sources as an instrument in the teaching of history, or better of historical method, is sound; and within proper limits it is profitable. The compilations of source books and illustrative documents now accessible in many fields of history should prove a valuable aid when rationally used with the authorities on a period. But the prominence which is given in the catalogue announcements to the source methods, and to the advantages to be derived from their use, amounts to a pretentious fad in the smaller colleges which have advertised it; for their libraries are limited, their students inexperienced in historical studies, and the time devoted to history is small.

The fifth aim is naturally confined for the most part to the graduate seminaries in the large institutions which make a specialty of graduate work. But there is clearly a growing effort on the part of some state universities, and even in a number of small colleges, to do original and seminary work with undergraduates and to publish the results through some local channel as contributions to history drawn from published and manuscript sources.

There are a few instances of the use of antiquated text-books. Must students still wade through Guizot and Buckle, exaggerations, imperfections, and all, just because these men made such remarkable contributions to the study of history in the days of our fathers? Have not the best things which they gave us been incorporated in approved form in the later improved text-books?

#### V. METHODS OF HISTORICAL INSTRUCTION.

Some indication of the methods employed has been given in the preceding discussion of the aims. But a number of details must be added. The various catalogues, in the description of the proposed courses, give emphasis in many cases to the use of the topical method, in others to the making of notebooks or the preparation of essays or the making of frequent reports upon parallel reading done or sources

examined. But inquiry shows that none of these methods is used to the exclusion of the text-book. Indeed, almost without exception, the text-book is used with the undergraduate classes.

The students are required to use such library facilities as are at hand, both for parallel references and for practice in consulting the sources. Informal lectures are the rule, and supplementary lectures are not rare. The informal lectures, so called, may be described as prepared remarks based upon the assigned lesson which the class has prepared, which may extend to the limits of the hour or may occupy only a few minutes, and which come unannounced and as the exigencies of the quiz may require. Indeed, they are merely a running comment on the quiz. The supplementary lectures, so called, seem to be lectures which come in sets or groups, generally in the very comprehensive courses, bridging over from period to period, or enlarging upon some topic as the judgment and personal taste of the professor may lead him to supplement the text-book.

The graduate work is conducted by means of lectures as a rule, and there is perhaps a tendency to lecture more freely to the upper-class men than to the lower-class men, even though the lectures be the first undergraduate work in history.

#### VI. LIBRARY FACILITIES.

The library facilities for the study of history are only fair, though clearly improving. College libraries are small and the income insufficient to enable them to keep up with the new literature and the best modern authorities. Thus it is sometimes the case that a library fairly large in numbers contains many books which are out of date, and accordingly has a disproportionately low grade as a working library. The instances in which the professors feel constrained to put their own private libraries at the service of their students are numerous enough to call for mention as showing the difficulties under which some of the more ambitious ones are working. In only a few instances are the colleges near enough to any public general library or state library or Historical Association collection to make such treasures available for the use of students.

#### VII. DIVISION OF TIME BETWEEN AMERICAN AND EUROPEAN HISTORY.

In sixty-five institutions there are almost exactly four hundred hours of work given in general and European history and politics, and two hundred in American history and politics. Only fifteen institutions give equal or greater time to American history. Five give no

course in American history at all; and one gives no European, and, as it happens, only three and one-third hours of American.

Often the sequence of courses (ancient, mediæval, modern), running through successive terms, betrays the idea that a well-bred college student must at all hazards be made acquainted with universal history in the order of its occurrence. The upper-class man may thus in due time have a brief course in American history or constitutional law to make his education complete.

Quite as often one can detect the notion that the students upon entering college have had so much instruction in American history that, forsooth, general or European history has the first claim upon a place in the college curriculum. Rarely is a course in American history, or even in civics, offered to the lower-class men. But no such estimate of the value of the school course in American history is warranted, under present conditions of school instruction least of all. Practically nothing has been learned about it in an accurate sense; and the chance of the student ever having an opportunity to learn is greatly reduced by postponing it so late in the course, for the number of students in southern colleges who stay but a year or two is large.

There is still another reason leading to the postponement of the course in American history where several courses are offered, and one that stands upon a sounder basis of reason. It is the consensus of opinion among many of the best teachers that it is better to use a course in general or English history for the training of beginners.

While in undergraduate courses the instruction in general and European history is double that given in American history, in the graduate courses the time is more equally distributed between the two.

#### VIII. REQUIREMENTS IN HISTORY FOR GRADUATION.

Out of sixty-five institutions reporting on this point, twelve make history elective. Twenty-three require one year, and thirty require two or more years for graduation in some, if not in all, groups or courses leading to a degree. Forty-eight institutions report 5,397 students out of a total of 9,744 undergraduates to be taking history at one and the same time. This is 55 per cent. of the student body, and, making all allowances for the large proportion of new students each year by reason of the failure of the old students to return and for the students who are pursuing a second and a third course in history, we must interpret this to mean that every student, with rare exceptions, takes some history, whether required or optional, whether he is pursuing a

course toward a degree or is to be a student for only one or two years. Indeed, the courses in history must be reckoned attractive courses for the average student.

The value of history, long held in depreciation, is rising to a position in the curriculum more commensurate with its pedagogical and cultural value. Probably the first suggestion for a distinct chair of history in America came from Rev. Hugh Jones, in 1724, for William and Mary College. The University of North Carolina provided instruction in history quite characteristically through the professor of humanity; but in 1796 a school of history and moral philosophy was projected. The work of Thomas R. Dew as professor of history in William and Mary College in 1827 is quite remarkable. The South Carolina College, at Columbia, S. C., seems to have had a chair as early as 1823, and Lieber in 1835 went to a full chair of history and political economy in that institution. In 1857 Professor George Frederick Holmes was given the chair of history and English, then just established as a distinct chair, at the University of Virginia. Indeed, few institutions of note in the South before the war had failed to make some provision for instruction in history. Though the provision was slight when tested by modern standards, it was, so far as the committee has been able to learn, fairly comparable with the provisions made in other sections of the country, especially if allowance is made for the newness of the Gulf and interior states. But in the North the improvement went on uninterruptedly, and in late years it has gone on very rapidly; while in the South it was interrupted by the war, and for a number of years did no more than to follow the traditions of the *ante-bellum* period, and in many instances scarcely as much as that.

A number of reasons have been advanced, with more or less plausibility, to account for this state of affairs. It is only half an explanation to attribute it to the financial and industrial demoralization of that period; for this does not explain why in the general poverty history fared worse than Latin or Greek or mathematics. It is further said that the South in its agricultural reconstruction has lost its taste for reading and for libraries of solid matter, and this is partly true; for, even if the old South was cultured though agricultural, it is undoubtedly true that the later agricultural conditions have not been so favorable to culture. By others it is attributed to the influence of the veteran, sometimes denounced as pernicious influence. But such a characterization is exaggerated and indiscriminating.

Compare the situation in the two sections. In the North the improvement went on uninterruptedly after the war, it has been said. Indeed, it was greatly promoted by the war. The North had won a victory; it had preserved the nation undivided. It was very proud of its achievement, and it gloried in the history of the government which its efforts and sacrifices had maintained. This was but the common experience the world over, and perfectly in accord with universal human nature. War, especially a successful war, will not fail to arouse the patriotism of its participants to the highest pitch. They will glorify, they will sometimes idealize the war, its results, and the government or fatherland in whose behalf it has been fought. Critics may belittle the war of 1812 and pronounce it a dismal failure from a military and a diplomatic point of view. But to the average American it was and it is the second and definitive war of independence against England. The Spanish-American war, brief as it was, and little as it jeopardized the national existence, was, at the time and since, frequently remarked for the effect it had in arousing the patriotism of the people, north and south, east and west, and fusing them into a nation, one and indivisible, as thirty-seven years of peace and growing amity had not succeeded in doing. No wonder that the Civil War served to stimulate the interests of the North in history, national and general.

Now, the results of that war had an obverse and a reverse side; and the very same results which in the North stimulated an interest in history served in the South to dampen the patriotic ardor of the people for nearly a generation. Only of late has the interest in history revived; only in late years have the old Declaration of Independence and the Fourth of July returned somewhat to popular favor. The government, which stood for the nation with the people of the North, and the government in which they gloried, was the very government which had humiliated the people of the South. They could not exult in its glories. It was asking too much of human nature to expect it.

For years the South lay under the dark shadow of this bitter war, and felt the pressure of an administration less regardful of state rights and less considerate of local sentiment in dealing with local affairs than the administration against which the war had been originally undertaken. People still felt too passionately to be able to speak with impunity all they felt, or to be able to listen silently to a cold and philosophical deliverance upon the results determined by the "arbitrament of the sword." So people kept, for the most part, wisely silent. American political history was tabooed.

But the times have changed, and it is no longer so. The veteran still feels deeply, but has better control of his feelings. He is sensitive; but no more so, occasion for occasion, south of Mason and Dixon's line than north of it. He is growing old, and his fellows are rapidly passing away; and it peculiarly behooves the southern veterans, as self-respecting parents of children and grandchildren who hold them in filial regard, to see to it that their names go down to history untarnished by false accusation and unclouded by misrepresentation. To this end they have grown bold, and have become very active in challenging every statement that is untrue or colored by bias and in putting to record everything that can serve to vindicate them in the eyes of posterity. Though defeated in war, they are determined not to suffer the common lot of the defeated who do not write their own history. If their activities have embarrassed the writing and teaching of history somewhat, the embarrassment has been felt much more in the public common school than in the college, where it has been felt scarcely at all; and over against it must be set the influence in stimulating historical study and investigation exerted by the many patriotic societies.

This was, however, by no means the only cause. The industrial development of the South, with the outward look upon the world that comes with it, the remnants of the old culture, the very lapse of time and rise of a new and curious generation, are among the causes which it is impossible within the limits of this report to set forth *seriatim* and in full. It must here suffice to add that the proper scientific bent and crowning touch was given to the movement by Johns Hopkins University. Founded more than twenty-five years ago on border ground and under circumstances which identified it with no sect, section, or political philosophy, pervaded from the first by a thoroughly scientific atmosphere, the stimulus it gave to graduate work in literature and philology, science and philosophy, the whole country over, has put the whole American people under a great and lasting obligation. Its work in the field of history and political science suffers nothing in comparison with the magnitude of its contributions in any other field, and the whole country, the North and the South alike, has felt its influence. Unusual inducements were held out to southern men to become students in Johns Hopkins University. They went there and entered all departments and, graduating, returned, many of them, to wield an influence at home.

For these causes, among others, it is, then, that the study, and the

scientific study, of history is rapidly increasing in the South. Greater provisions are being made for giving instruction, and greater attainments are expected of those who are to teach it. According to the best information accessible to the committee, one-third of the institutions under consideration have, within the last ten or twelve years, materially extended their departments of history and put them in charge of men who have had the best modern opportunities for preparation for their work. Indeed, with two or three exceptions, these new teachers are young southern men who have taken their doctor's degree in philosophy by work in history and political science since 1890.

Typical of the strong impression which the demands of history have made on those interested in colleges and responsible for their management, is the action of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, regarding the church schools. The board of education of this church, which was established in 1894 and given ample authority to that end, has decreed and is carrying out a systematic and exacting classification and grading of the institutions supported by the church. In the first place, the work of the training school and that of the college are carefully differentiated, though the minimum requirements for admission to college are not yet very high. Secondly, a college, in order to be recognized as such, must have a faculty of at least seven officers of the grade of professor or adjunct professor—positions which are considered to be attractive to men who have made themselves specialists in some particular line; and one of whom must have had such special training in history. Thirdly, a standard minimum curriculum is prescribed which, for the B.A. degree, requires that four-tenths of the course shall be in language and literature, ancient and modern, foreign and English; one-tenth in pure mathematics; one-tenth in natural science; one-tenth, or say three hours per week through two years, in "history, social science, philosophy, and the English Bible;" and the remaining three-tenths may be elected from the four groups named. As a result, the status of history in the faculty and in the curriculum of these institutions has been materially raised in the last half-dozen years. Within the same period most of the states have increased the provisions for history in their respective state universities.

#### IX. GRADUATE WORK.

Naturally, only a limited number of southern institutions can aspire to do graduate work of a high order. They have neither the

library equipment nor the teaching force necessary. Twenty institutions offer graduate courses of instruction in history, nine of them offering only one course each. Very rarely is the Ph.D. degree conferred for major work in history outside of Johns Hopkins University, and the committee would raise the question whether any institutions whose limited facilities are well known can afford for their own good name to confer it. But the master's degree is conferred much more frequently. It is unfortunate that this degree, and also the bachelor's degree which underlies it, should stand for such different amounts of work, quantitatively and qualitatively, as it does among southern institutions. Peculiarly unfortunate is it if either student or college sets up the obtaining of the advanced degree as the prime and coveted object, and looks upon the course in history as merely a convenient means to that end, and not rather a favorable opportunity for getting more instruction in history than could otherwise be offered to the student in the local institution. In fact, two things can be said about these so-called graduate courses in the smaller institutions, and they are undoubtedly the points upon which chief reliance must be placed to vindicate their existence. In the first place, they are open to, and frequently taken by, undergraduate students who are interested in history, and have previously taken all that it has yet been possible to get into the regular undergraduate curriculum either as required or optional courses. In the second place, it is the pride and pleasure of many professors through these courses to train and stimulate their students to undertake advanced work under more favorable conditions in larger institutions. It is from this class that the students have gone out who have won honors at the great universities of the land.

Not only does Johns Hopkins University fall fairly within the territorial range of this report, but it bears a very close and unique relation to the South above other sections of the country. More than half of its students are southerners. About one-third of its teaching staff is recruited from the South—*i. e.*, some forty; and nearly two hundred former students are at present teaching in the South, distributed in every state and among more than sixty-five institutions. Nearly a score are teaching history and political science.

#### X. THE STUDY OF SOUTHERN HISTORY.

The committee is happy to be able to close this report with a statement concerning the work done in the study of southern history, which for amount and quality and future promise is alike honorable and



gratifying. There is, first of all, a long series of published investigations, dissertations, doctors' theses, and monographs by southern young men, the result in nearly every case of work begun by them when graduate students at Johns Hopkins, Columbia, Harvard, Chicago, and elsewhere. Houston's *History of Nullification in South Carolina*, Garner's *Reconstruction in Mississippi*, Trent's *Life of Gilmore Sims*, and Woodrow Wilson's *Division and Reunion* are perhaps the best known examples. Besides these, and many miscellaneous articles too numerous to mention in this report, there is a series of Johns Hopkins "Studies in History and Political Science," many of which are upon southern subjects.

There is a very close personal union between the State Historical Societies of Mississippi and Texas and the department of history in the state universities of these states which has led in the one case to the publication of a stout annual volume of papers and documents, and to the publication of the *Quarterly* of the Texas State Historical Association on the other. The faculty of the State University of Missouri has begun the publication of a series of historical studies; and the State Historical Society of Missouri, organized a few years ago and located at the university, will soon begin the publication of a periodical bulletin of some nature. The William and Mary College *Quarterly Historical Magazine* has long been an efficient organ of local state and national history. The *Sewanee Review* and the *South Atlantic Quarterly*, though general in their scope, make important historical contributions. Randolph-Macon College publishes annually the John P. Branch papers, with the income of the John P. Branch fund. Washington and Lee, Hampden-Sidney, the Universities of Tennessee and North Carolina, Trinity College, Guilford College, the Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Vanderbilt University, and perhaps others, are all contributing through occasional publications or regularly through active societies.

In some instances courses are given in southern history. Important among these is the work done by the graduate students of the University of Texas under the direction of Professor Garrison. Admission into the graduate work is practically limited to those who by knowledge of Spanish as well as of history are capable of doing original work, and they are occupied in studying the early history of the state. The Austin papers and other large and valuable collections of documents are already in the hands of the State Historical Society located at the university, and its collections are rapidly growing under the efficient

direction of Professor Garrison and the liberality of the state and its citizens.

FREDERICK W. MOORE, *Chairman*, Vanderbilt University.

LYON G. TYLER, President William and Mary College.

B. J. RAMAGE, University of the South.

J. C. BALLAGH, Johns Hopkins University.

J. S. BASSETT, Trinity College.